

Applic. No. : 09/272,075

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-11 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-2 and 6-8 have been rejected as being anticipated by *Echensperger et al.* (US 6,199,160) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

In item 8 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 3-5 and 9-11 have been rejected as being obvious over *Echensperger et al.* under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In the paragraph bridging pages 6-7 of the Office action, the Examiner stated:

As to points (1) and (2), the term "administration" is broadly used in independent claim 1 and does not adequately describe the function of administration or performance of administration (i.e. is it intended to mean that remotely administrates data/information stored in the virtual terminal?). *Echensperger* does not specifically use the term "administration". However, *Echensperger* discloses that the remote terminal (T, fig. 2) is connected to the virtual terminal (4, fig. 2) via communication link (L_{t1}, fig. 2) in order to transmit data streams between the two terminals (i.e. remote administration; col. 7, lines 21-38). When tasks are performed including updating, or installing new information remotely from another machine in a network, that is called remote administration.

Applic. No. : 09/272,075

The rejections and the Examiner's comments have been considered. Claim 1 has been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes can be found on page 1, lines 14-23, of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 as amended calls for, inter alia:

A telecommunication system *used by subscribers* and *administrated remotely by an administrator*, comprising:

a telecommunications apparatus having a virtual terminal with properties of a terminal with administration authorization; and

a remote computer connected to said virtual terminal of said telecommunications apparatus exchanging *only administrative changes* to the telecommunication system, *for remote administration* of said telecommunications apparatus.

As discussed in great detail in the response dated April 17, 2003, *Echensperger et al.* are not concerned, disclose, or suggest a **telecommunication** system. Similarly, *Echensperger et al.* are not concerned, disclose, or suggest remote **administration**. Consequently, *Echensperger et al.* do not

Applic. No. : 09/272,075

disclose a telecommunication system with a remote administration function.

In item 11 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 1-11 have been rejected as being obvious over *Shaffer et al.* (US 6,185,290) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As discussed in great detail in the response dated April 17, 2003, *Shaffer et al.* disclose **usage** of the telecommunication network but no **administration** of the telecommunication network. *Shaffer et al.* do not mention the word "administration" (the term "administrative burdens" is mentioned in col.1, lines 32-33).

The inventive concept of the invention as recited in claim 1 is to connect a virtual terminal of a telecommunications apparatus to a remote computer for remote administration of the telecommunications apparatus by exchanging **only administrative changes** to the telecommunication system. Exchanging **only administrative changes** is not disclosed or suggested by either *Echensperger et al.* or *Shaffer et al.*

It is accordingly believed to be clear that *Echensperger et al.* do not show the features of claim 1 and *Shaffer et al.* do not suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and because claims 2-11

Applic. No. : 09/272,075

are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

10-02-'03 14:24 FROM-Lerner & Greenberg

+9549251101

T-458 P09/09 U-111

Applic. No. : 09/272,075

Respectfully submitted,



Markus Nolff (Reg. No. 37,006)

October 2, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101